

CSP-2017-1 RI - Final Draft RI Agland Pasture

Soil Erosion

Sheet and Rill Erosion

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Screening level: Permanent ground cover > 90% and slope < 10%.
Assessment level: The water erosion rate is <= T.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

Plant cover controls active erosion (shallow <1 foot deep rills/gullies) and runoff from normal rain events. No litter dams or terracettes are present.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Wind Erosion

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Screening level: Permanent ground cover > 90% and slope < 10%.
Assessment level: The wind erosion rate is <= T.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

All areas expected to have high erosion rates are stable.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Classic Gully Erosion

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Screening level: Classic gullies are not present. Assessment level: Classic gully management is adequate to stop the progression of head cutting and widening and are offsite impacts are minimized by vegetation and/or structures.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

Plant cover controls active erosion (gullies <1 foot deep).

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1 RI - Final Draft RI Agland Pasture

Streambank, Shoreline, Water Conveyance Channels

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Screening level: Streams, shoreline or channels are not adjacent to site.
Assessment level: Bank erosion is beyond the client's control or
commensurate with normal geomorphological processes, AND PCS -
streambank/shoreline erosion element score is ≥ 4 .

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

All stream and channel banks, pond and other shorelines are stable.

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1 RI - Final Draft RI Agland Pasture

Soil Quality Degradation

Organic Matter Depletion

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Screening level: Permanent ground cover > 80%. Assessment level:
The SCI is > 0, OR the PCS - plant cover element score is >= 4 AND
the PCS - plant residue element score is >= 4.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

Plants are perennial, adapted to the site, productive and healthy.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Compaction

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Screening level: Soil compaction is not a problem AND activities do
not cause soil compaction problems. Assessment level: The PCS -
compaction element score is >= 4.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

Soils are not compacted past a point that limits plant root depth and
growth.

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1 RI - Final Draft RI Agland Pasture

Excess Water

Runoff and Flooding and Ponding

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Ponding or flooding not a problem AND activities do not cause ponding/flooding problems. Assessment level: Excess water is managed to meet client's objectives.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Excess water is managed to meet client's objectives.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1 RI - Final Draft RI Agland Pasture

Insufficient Water

Inefficient Moisture Management

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Moisture management is not a problem AND activities do not cause inefficient moisture management problems.
Assessment level: The PCS - compaction element score is ≥ 4 AND the PCS - plant cover element score is ≥ 4 .

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Predominate plants are adapted to the site, usual rain fall, and are useful as intended.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1 RI - Final Draft RI Agland Pasture

Water Quality Degradation

Pesticides in Surface Water

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Pest control chemicals are not applied. Assessment level: Pesticides are stored, handled, disposed and managed to prevent runoff, spills, leaks and leaching AND conservation practices and managements are in place to minimize surface water impacts.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

A site-specific mixture of prevention, avoidance, monitoring, and suppression (PAMS) strategies are applied. If pesticide application is required, an environmental risk screening tool is used (such as WIN-PST or similar LGU approval tool) and application rates and timing are compliant with the label and the conservation plan.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Pesticides in Ground Water

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Pest control chemicals are not applied. Assessment level: Pesticides are stored, handled, disposed and managed to prevent runoff, spills, leaks and leaching AND conservation practices and managements are in place to minimize ground water impacts.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

A site-specific mixture of prevention, avoidance, monitoring, and suppression (PAMS) strategies are applied. If pesticide application is required, an environmental risk screening tool is used (such as WIN-PST or similar LGU approval tool) and application rates and timing are compliant with the label and the conservation plan.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1 RI - Final Draft RI Agland Pasture

Nutrients in Surface Water

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Organic or inorganic nutrients are not applied AND grazed PLU is not adjacent to streams, ponds, or lakes AND there are no confined livestock areas. Assessment level: The PCS - streambank/shoreline erosion element score is ≥ 4 AND the PCS - livestock concentration areas element score is ≥ 4 , OR Nutrients are applied and based on a soil test, tissue test or nutrient budget.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

If nutrients are applied, they do not degrade surface/ground water quality. Water use is not limited.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Livestock access to stream is controlled OR limited to small watering or crossing areas

Yes ☐ No ☐

Nutrients in Ground Water

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Organic or inorganic nutrients are not applied AND grazed PLU is not adjacent to streams, ponds, or lakes AND there are no confined livestock areas. Assessment level: The PCS - streambank/shoreline erosion element score is ≥ 4 AND the PCS - livestock concentration areas element score is ≥ 4 , OR Nutrients are applied and based on a soil test, tissue test or nutrient budget.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

If nutrients are applied, they do not degrade surface/ground water quality. Water use is not limited.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1 RI - Final Draft RI Agland Pasture

Excess Pathogens and Chemicals from Manure, Bio-solids or Compost Applications in Surface Water

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Screening level: Potential sources of pathogens or pharmaceuticals are not applied on the land. Assessment level: Organic materials are applied, stored, and/or handled to mitigate negative impacts to surface water sources.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

Manure, compost, or biosolids are applied per their test report. Grazing management optimizes applied products.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Livestock access to stream is controlled OR limited to small watering or crossing areas

Yes ☐ No ☐

Petroleum, Heavy Metal and Other Pollutants Transported to Surface Water

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Screening level: Activities do not present the potential for contamination by petroleum, heavy metals and other pollutants. Assessment level: Petroleum, heavy metals or other potential pollutants are stored and handled to avoid runoff to surface water.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

Soil amendments are applied per their test report. Grazing management maintains adequate cover to reduce pollutant transport to surface water.

Yes ☐ No ☐

The fuel storage area and tank is located: - above the 100-year floodplain, - a minimum of 100 feet from any river, stream, ditch, pond, lake, sinkhole, wetland, or water well, and - within a stable place designed to provide secondary containment if the primary means were to fail.

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1 RI - Final Draft RI Agland Pasture

Petroleum, Heavy Metal and Other Pollutants Transported to Ground Water

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Activities do not present the potential for contamination by petroleum, heavy metals and other pollutants.
 Assessment level: Petroleum, heavy metals or other potential pollutants are stored and handled to avoid runoff to groundwater.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

The fuel storage area and tank is located: - above the 100-year floodplain, - a minimum of 100 feet from any river, stream, ditch, pond, lake, sinkhole, wetland, or water well, and - within a stable place designed to provide secondary containment if the primary means were to fail.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Excessive Sediment in Surface Water

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Permanent ground cover $> 90\%$ and slope $< 10\%$ AND classic gullies are not present AND streams or shoreline are not on or adjacent to site. Assessment level: Upslope treatment and buffer practices address concentrated flows to water bodies AND the SVAP2 - bank condition ≥ 5 AND the livestock and vehicle water crossings are stable AND The water erosion rate is $\leq T$ AND wind erosion rate is $\leq T$.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Plant cover controls active erosion (shallow < 1 foot deep rills/gullies) and runoff from normal rain events. No litter dams are present.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1 RI - Final Draft RI Agland Pasture

Elevated Water Temperature

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Water courses on or adjacent to the site are not designated by a State Agency as a temperature impairment OR water course temperature is not a client concern. Assessment level: The SVAP2 - riparian area quality element score is ≥ 5 AND the SVAP2 - riparian area quantity quality element score is ≥ 5 AND the SVAP2 - canopy cover element score is ≥ 6 , OR existing conservation practices are in place to address water temperature.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

More than 50 percent of the water surface is shaded on the length of the stream/river you control.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1 RI - Final Draft RI Agland Pasture

Air Quality Impacts

Emissions of Particulate Matter (PM) and PM Precursors

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Activities are not present that contribute to agricultural source PM or PM precursor emissions AND episodes or complaints of emissions of PM (dust, smoke, exhaust, etc.), or chemical drift have not occurred. PM producing activity examples are: Prescribed Burn is conducted, Travel ways unpaved or untreated with binding agents, Engines (combustion source), Tillage, Pesticides are applied, Fertilization (manure/ commercial), CAFO/manure management). Assessment level: PM and PM Precursor emissions are managed to meet client objectives.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Dust is controlled on all non-vegetated, unpaved travel ways.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Emission of Greenhouse Gases (GHGs)

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Activities are not present that produce GHGs emissions. GHG producing activities are: Fertilization(manure/commercial), CAFO/manure management, Engines (combustion source), Tillage, AND GHGs are not regulated in this planning area. Assessment level: Greenhouse gas emissions are managed to meet client objectives.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Forage Supply and Demand Balance is achieved.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1 RI - Final Draft RI Agland Pasture

Objectionable Odors

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Screening level: Activities are not present that contribute to odor nuisance air quality conditions. Odor nuisance producing activities are: Pesticide application, CAFO/manure management, Composting is conducted, AND odor sources are not regulated in this planning area AND episodes or complaints of odor nuisance have not occurred. Assessment level: Odors are managed to meet client objectives.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

Waste is not land applied when and in locations that would produce objectionable odors.

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1 RI - Final Draft RI Agland Pasture

Degraded Plant Condition

Undesirable Plant Productivity and Health

Planning Criteria

Assessment level: The PCS is 30 or above. Plants are adapted to the site, meet production goals and do not negatively impact other resources.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Plants are perennial, adapted to the site, productive and healthy.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Inadequate Structure and Composition

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Plant communities support the intended land use and desired ecological functions. Assessment level: Plant communities contain adequate diversity, composition and structure to support desired ecological functions.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

The current plants provide the desired habitat structure and composition.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Excessive Plant Pest Pressure

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Plant productivity is not limited from pest pressure. Assessment level: The PCS - insect and disease pressure element score is ≥ 4 AND the PCS - site adaptation element score is ≥ 4 .

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Plant growth and cover is managed as to inhibit pest plant introduction.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1 RI - Final Draft RI Agland Pasture

Fish and Wildlife - Inadequate Habitat

Inadequate Habitat - Food

Planning Criteria

Assessment level: The WHSI rating is ≥ 0.5 AND (when surface stream present) the SVAP2 - fish habitat complexity element score is ≥ 7 AND the SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is ≥ 7 , OR conservation practices and managements are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds, OR food is available in quality and extent to support habitat requirements for the species of interest.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

The plant cover provides food for the chosen wildlife species.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1 RI - Final Draft RI Agland Pasture

Inadequate Habitat - Cover/Shelter

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Assessment level: The WHSI rating is ≥ 0.5 AND (when surface stream present) the SVAP2 - barriers to movement element score is ≥ 7 AND the SVAP2 - fish habitat complexity element score is ≥ 7 AND the SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is ≥ 7 , OR conservation practices and managements are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds, OR cover is of available quality and extent to support habitat requirements for the species of interest.

Yes ☐

No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

The stream(s) have: - a natural, unaltered configuration, with minimal channel straightening, dredging, or bank alteration by armoring with rip-rap or other non-natural materials, - stable banks with limited erosion or bank failure, and - human uses and/or grazing levels that do not negatively impact bank condition.

Yes ☐

No ☐

The plant cover provides cover and shelter for the chosen wildlife species.

Yes ☐

No ☐

Forage cutting and removal matches NRCS local guidelines for desired species.

Yes ☐

No ☐

Livestock access to stream is controlled OR limited to small watering or crossing areas

Yes ☐

No ☐

The pond/lake, which supports a natural or planted fish population, is managed: -to exclude livestock, -to control nuisance species and undesirable aquatic vegetation controlled, -to complies with state and local regulations when stocking the pond, AND -use of a buffer zone of diverse, natural plant cover at least 35 feet wide.

Yes ☐

No ☐

CSP-2017-1 RI - Final Draft RI Agland Pasture

Inadequate Habitat - Habitat Continuity (Space)

Planning Criteria

Assessment level: The WHSI rating is ≥ 0.5 AND (when surface stream present) the SVAP2 - barriers to movement element score is ≥ 7 AND the SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is ≥ 7 , OR conservation practices and managements are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds, OR The connectivity of habitat components are adequate to support stable populations of targeted species.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Connectivity between food resources and cover and shelter is provided for the chosen wildlife species. <see State Wildlife Action Plan>

Evaluation Test Met

Yes ☐ No ☐

Plant cover provides space for wildlife species.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Forage cutting and removal matches NRCS local guidelines for desired species.

Yes ☐ No ☐

The land adjacent to a stream, river, or other waterbody on the side or sides you control does: - have diverse, natural plant cover typical to that along streams in your area, AND - extend from the stream bank/shoreline for a distance of 35 feet or (if applicable) the minimum State buffer-width requirement, whichever is greater.

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1 RI - Final Draft RI Agland Pasture

Livestock Production Limitation

Inadequate Feed and Forage

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Assessment level: When the land use has a "grazed" modifier, livestock forage, roughage and supplemental nutritional requirements addressed.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

The existing feed/forage quantity/quality meet the livestock needs and goals.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Inadequate Shelter

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Assessment level: When the land use has a "grazed" modifier, artificial or natural shelters meet animal health needs and client objectives.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

Livestock have adequate shelter.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Inadequate Water

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Assessment level: When the land use has a "grazed" modifier, water of acceptable quality and quantity adequately distributed to meet animal needs.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

The livestock have enough drinking water of good quality.

Yes ☐ No ☐

CSP-2017-1 RI - Final Draft RI Agland Pasture

Inefficient Energy Use

Equipment and Facilities

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Screening level: Client is not interested in improving equipment and facilities energy efficiency. Assessment level: Major components of a USDA approved energy audit have been implemented that address equipment and facilities to meet client objectives OR On-farm renewable energy and/or energy conserving practices have been implemented to meet client objectives.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

Renewable energy systems are applied. For example, solar, wind, geothermal, or hydro.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Farming/Ranching Practices and Field Operations

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Screening level: Client is not interested in improving equipment and facilities energy efficiency. Assessment level: Major components of a USDA approved energy audit have been implemented that address equipment and facilities to meet client objectives OR On-farm renewable energy and/or energy conserving practices have been implemented to meet client objectives.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

Renewable energy systems are applied. For example, solar, wind, geothermal, or hydro.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Recommendations/components of an energy audit have been applied. The audit addressed equipment and facilities on the farm. For example, energy loss from lighting, drying, refrigeration, heating, or building insulation have been improved.

Yes ☐ No ☐